

elects Species I shown in Figs. 1-3, 5 and 6. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are believed to readable thereon.

Applicant does not traverse the Restriction.

No change of inventorship is necessitated by the Election.

#### R E M A R K S

Comments of Primary Examiner MORAN have been reviewed carefully along with pertinent sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, legal treatises and relevant decisional law. Applicant has been required to elect a single one from three (3) species, namely Species I shown in Figs. 1-3, 5 and 6; or Species II shown in Fig. 4; or Species III shown in Fig. 7.

Applicant has elected to prosecute Species I shown in Figs. 1-3, 5 and 6 in the present Application. Applicant continues to assert allowability of non elected species for further prosecution in divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part Applications or otherwise.


Applicant does not traverse the Restriction. No change to inventorship is necessitated by the Election.

If a generic claim is allowed, Applicant reserves its right to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

It is believed that the foregoing constitutes a complete response to the Restriction. If anything further is required, Applicant's Attorney will appreciate the courtesy of a telephone call.

Skill of the Examiner are acknowledged and appreciated. Action on the merits of the Application is appreciated.

Respectfully,



CHARLES E. BAXLEY  
Attorney of Record  
USPTO Reg 20,149  
90 John Street, Third Floor  
New York, NY 10038  
Tel: (212) 791-7200  
Fax: (212) 791-7276  
E-Mail:ceb@hartbaxley.com

CEB:lp/13857B